## SAMPLE UNILATERAL RATE RECOMMENDATION WHEN RECENT RELEVANT DATA EXISTS

| MEMORANDUM                    | FOR COMMAN                                   | NDER,  |                      |             |              |
|-------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|-------------|--------------|
| ATTENTION:                    |  |  |                      |             |              |
| SUBJECT:                      | FAR 52.216-<br>Submission o<br>[Contractor N | Failure to Comply<br>7(d)(2)<br>f Final Indirect Rat<br>Jame]    | te Cost Proposal E   |             | _            |
| costs proposal(s) for         | or the fiscal year(                          | niled to submit to the s) endingnas not responded to             | as requir            | ed by FA    | AR 52.216-   |
| 2(c)(2) and FAR 4             | 2.705(c)(1), we really                       | nments financial in<br>ecommend your of<br>s that are set low en | fice unilaterally es | stablish fi | nal indirect |
| Historically recommended unil | •  | nedpercent of insent (FAO explanared) Application                | _                    |             | _            |
| Rate                          |  | Base   | <u>19XX</u>          | X           | <u>19XX</u>  |

We recommend immediate and continued use of the above rates to close completed contracts until the contractor completes its contractual responsibility of submitting a certified final indirect cost rate proposal for the subject years. After you make the unilateral indirect cost rate determination, we would be pleased to assist you in calculating the unilateral cost by contract.

{insert the following paragraph when the historical questioned costs is less than 20 percent} However, we believe that just using a historical decrement may not fully protect the government's interest. The contractor has not fulfilled its contractual requirements to submit a proposal, has not certified to any costs, and a historical decrement based upon audit results does not account for any unallowable costs that the contractor may voluntarily delete from its submission. In our audit experience for FYs 2000 and 2001, the top 100 contractors with questioned costs who do submit and certify their proposals averaged questioned costs in excess of 20 percent. We believe that contractors who do not even submit proposals present a significant risk, and suggest you consider using the 20 percent decrement factor in determining the unilateral contract costs even if the contractor's historical questioned cost is lower.

DIIS File "NMLTR6MONHIST Version 1.0 July 2002

| Please direct any questions concerning this memorandum to | )              |
|---|----------------|
| Supervisory Auditor at                                    |                |
|   |                |
|   |                |
|   | Branch Manager |

## Attachments:

Initial Request Letter 30-Day Late Letter 3 Month Late Memorandum 5 Month Late Letter